

The Comptroller General of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

Decision

Holmes & Narver/Morrison-Knudsen

Matter of:

B-233103

File:

Date:

October 18, 1988

DIGEST

Agency decision to terminate a contract line item for the convenience of the government and to resolicit the requirement is a matter of contract administration which is not for consideration under General Accounting Office Bid Protest Regulations.

DECISION

Holmes & Narver/Morrison-Knudsen (Holmes), a joint venture, protests the Army's determination to terminate a contract line item (CLIN) for laundry service under Holmes' contract No. DAAH03-83-C-0049.

On September 20, 1988, the Army exercised its option to extend Holmes' contract, including CLIN 0177, for fiscal year 1989.1/ The protester states that on September 30, however, the Army terminated CLIN 0177 for the convenience of the government and awarded another firm a contract to perform the same services.

Generally, our Office will not review an agency's decision to terminate a contract for the convenience of the government since by law this is a matter of contract administration for consideration by a contract appeals board or by a court of competent jurisdiction. Hero, Inc., B-221820, May 12, 1986, 86-1 CPD ¶ 450. We review contract terminations only where the contracting agency's action is based upon a determination that the contract was improperly awarded. Id.

^{1/} Apparently, the Army awarded this contract to Holmes approximately 5 years ago. CLIN 0177 for laundry service was one of the services required under Holmes' contract for base operations.

In its protest, Holmes cites decisions of our Office in which we have reviewed an agency's decision to terminate a contract and to resolicit. See Tiger Optical Electronics Corp., B-225358, Nov. 13, 1986, 86-2 CPD ¶ 560; W.H. Smith Hardware Co., B-222045, May 13, 1986, 86-1 CPD ¶ 455. In those cases, however, the agency's actions were based on a determination that the contract which was terminated had been improperly awarded. Here, there is no allegation that Holmes' contract was improperly awarded, nor is such a conclusion supported by the record. Accordingly, the issue raised by the protester is not for our review.

The protest is dismissed.

Ronald Berger

Associate General Counsel